

THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF NORTH VANCOUVER

**Meeting of the Advisory Design Panel
Held at City Hall, 141 West 14th Street, North Vancouver, B.C.
In Conference Room A on Wednesday, November 15th, 2017**

MINUTES

- Present:** B. Checkwitch
J.P. Mahé
B. Phillips
P. Maltby
J. Geluch
B. Harrison
K. Yushmanova
K. Bracewell, RCMP
- Staff:** B. Hurley, Planner 1
D. Johnson, Development Planner
C. Perry, Supervisor, Development Servicing
R. Fish, Committee Clerk
- Guests:** 236 – 254 East 3rd Street (Rezoning Application)
Al Johnson, DA Architects + Planners
Mark Ehman, DA Architects + Planners
David Stoyko, Connect Landscape Architecture
- Moodyville – Wall Financial: Phase 1, 2A & 2B
Martin Bruckner, IBI Group
Padraig McMorrow, IBI Group
Smitha Vidyasagar, IBI Group
Grant Brumpton, PWL Partnership
Matt Gibbs, PWL Partnership
Bruno Wall, Wall Financial
Edmund Siqueira, Wall Financial
- Absent:** A. Man-Bourdon
-

A quorum being present, the meeting was called to order at 5:37 p.m.

1. Minutes of Meetings of the Advisory Design Panel held October 18th

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held October 18th be adopted.

Carried Unanimously

2. Business Arising

None.

3. Staff Update

None.

4. 236 – 254 East 3rd Street (Rezoning Application)

This application is for a Comprehensive Development Rezoning on the north side of the 200 block of East 3rd Street. The proposed design is for a set of 57 dwelling units presented with a base layer of two-storey townhouses facing E 3rd St with 5 storeys of apartments above that.

The building has 62 parking stalls (including 6 visitor stalls) located two stacked and independently accessed parkades on the lane. The proposal intends to pursue 5% better than ASHRAE 90.1-2010 as its energy compliance pathway. The 2.56 FSR project intends to achieve the Density Bonus through a mixture of Community Amenity Contribution and provision of an Affordable Home Ownership model to be defined and managed through Habitat for Humanity at a later time.

Staff would be interested in the Panel's input regarding the following:

- The overall height and massing of the building as it relates E 3rd street, the lane, and neighbouring units;
- The design, façade, and architectural expression of the building as it responds to and potentially impacts each frontage;
- The type, quality and application of exterior finishes.
- Parking configuration and circulation.
- Quality and overall effectiveness of the landscape plan, pedestrian circulation, as well as transitions between public private outdoor spaces;
- The livability of units and common spaces within the building; and
- Quality of livability and CPTED responses for the stacked townhouses and associated accessory lock-off units in this proposal.

Al Johnson, DA Architects + Planners, described the project to the Panel:

- There is a major slope on the site.
- Future road widening on East 3rd St will have an impact on the overall site.
- Access to parking off the lane will also be challenging.
- Taken a sympathetic approach to neighbours with the terracing.
- 3-storey podium, set back with 2-storeys and the top floor is set back even further.
- There are existing mature trees.
- We set back the parking so the roots on the adjacent property can be sustained.
- Every horizontal outdoor surface is used.
- Mix of units from 1 bedroom to larger 3 bedroom and den units throughout.
- 5 penthouse units.
- Primary materials are metal panels as well as brick.
- Contemporary aesthetic.

- Corten steel screen could have artists involved to design to announce the main entry of the building.
- Back on the lane side there are two parking entrance points.

David Stoyko, Connect Landscape Architecture, reviewed the landscape plan:

- Integration of landscape on all edges and terracing.
- Sub terraces have additional layers of green and have a good evergreen presence.
- High quality materials, tight edges, planters that come up and are integrated into the building.
- Low maintenance landscape plan.
- Tree retention as much as possible to preserve the trees on adjacent sites.
- Row of existing trees on east side.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- On the lower levels, the corridors are long and narrow at about 50m, are there any opportunities to open them up for day lighting? **A:** There are windows at the end of each corridor except for the townhouses. Every other floor has windows as well as the stairwells.
- The townhouses have their main entrance off 3rd and other entrances have light at both ends? **A:** Yes.
- Is it more of an exit corridor than entrance corridor? **A:** Yes.
- I appreciate you working with the grades to get two levels of parking; the 5% slope is that steep? **A:** That's the max you can have for parking. It's still handicap accessible.
- Do you find that too steep? **A:** It's a challenging site. Our preference would have been a flat site. We think the way we've dealt with the parking is innovative. We need 5% to achieve the clearance for the entrances at both ends to do this configuration.
- Is there an opportunity to bring daylight into the two levels of parking? **A:** Potentially on the lane side. Parking garages are lit at night which may have implications for the neighbours at night.
- Can it be mitigated by using motion sensors? **A:** Potentially.
- Is there an opportunity for the garbage area to be more inviting with windows and counters? How is it serviced? **A:** It is commercial pick up.
- Is there enough height? **Staff: A:** This will have to be dealt with in a team review.
- **Staff:** we asked the developer to provide a report for who is going to do the pick-up, showing that it's functional.
- Is there screening between the units on the terraces on level three? **A:** Yes, there are screens and deeper terraces. On the north side with larger terraces we have large planters intended to screen.
- For the elevator is there still a 1500mm wide corridor? **A:** Yes.
- Any opportunity to add a little extra room? On the top floor, there's quite a deep lobby going out to north terrace. **A:** That would just reduce the size of the units; it will be a bit of a trade-off.
- Are you not putting trees on upper levels due to concerns of blocking views? **A:** There is a concern with the uphill and overlook. As you get higher, the height will encroach further, we want to keep planting as lower planters.
- **To staff:** Is there an opportunity for street trees? **A:** Yes, they will have to redo the frontage.

- To staff: Do you anticipate the sites to east and west developing soon with similar setbacks? **A:** Yes, through subdivision and rezoning. The property to the west has an application in now but for façade improvements and rooftop decks. Down the block on level 5 projects, they are coming in with similar scales, 6 storeys.
- The side setback for RM1 is 15ft and the side setback for RM2 is close to 8ft.
- To staff: 7 storeys up 3rd St are acceptable? **A:** Yes, as 6 storeys under definition of the OCP, the proposal may be counted from the high side. They will have to ask for it at council but it is not against the OCP.

6:07PM – 6:10PM – Break to view the model.

- Have you considered including bike storage and plug-ins for e-bikes and e-cars? **A:** Yes, we will consider that.
- Planters that will be on the podiums are going to be standing, not poured? **A:** Some will be poured; the larger ones will be standing in place.
- Will the upper roof decks be accessed by a hatch? **A:** Yes.
- Will it be a hard surface? **A:** Yes.
- Please talk to the affordable housing and public benefit that you see? **A:** We are proposing to take this concept to council to determine if they are interested. Working with Habitat for Humanity, we are proposing two units, one three-bedroom unit and one two-bedroom with den. Those units are then put out to people who qualify under their program, the maximum people will pay who live in the units is 30% of their income. When people decide to move on, they get 80% of what they paid back, they get equity. We are also proposing for 4 units to be managed by Habitat for Humanity but in an employee based criteria as many live close. The units will be offered to current tenants first. We want to have 10% of the units addressing the housing issue
- Is there a gravel strip by PMT? **A:** Yes, it's not intended for access, it will be planted in.
- Can the stair windows be taken down on the lower levels to get light in on the east and west elevations? **A:** Part of those areas are at the side of the parking garage, there is an issue of overview from the neighbours.
- Could you consider a glass block? **A:** Yes, we can consider this.
- To staff: is the 1.0 bonus for a purpose built rental only? **A:** It comes automatically if you're doing a rental, but key parts of the Housing Action Plan needs to be met as well.
- To staff: the entire level of parking above grade is excluded from the FSR? **A:** Yes, that is how the bylaw is written.
- For the landscaping at the lane and east side, what techniques are you using to increase visibility and keep inappropriate activity away from the sides of the building? **A:** At the lane everything will be low, trees are raised with lighting, and there will be integrated lighting on the wall. We will work with the neighbours to keep the trees trimmed and maintained.
- Does the building beside have windows looking in? **A:** Some, but it's mainly decks.
- Is the metal panel aluminum? **A:** Yes.
- Can you give a description of the detailing of that panel? **A:** The panel sizes are 1 metre by 2.5 metres. Full wrap panel. The panel would go on the underside and soffit condition as well. It has a third dimension to it. It will have integrated flashing.
- In your sustainability statement, you have ASHRAE plus 5%, is that mandated or elected? **A:** We are offering this up as an approach. The Step Code is imminent but we wanted something beyond the minimum requirements.

- How far developed are the walls? **A:** Not very.
- How did the neighbourhood engagement session go? **A:** It went well. There was concern from the neighbours to the north regarding blocked views. There was concern about additional traffic in the lane as well; they would prefer the access coming off of 3rd St.
- Staff: approximately 50 people showed up. There were mixed responses with a number of questions and concerns regarding massing, traffic and process. There were a lot of answers provided. Staff have presented the limitations to place a parking entry off 3rd Street.
- Do you have a civil engineer on board? **A:** Yes.
- Have you calculated the building grade? **A:** Yes, drawings have been provided.

Comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- The design is good, bold and contemporary. Use of good materials, colours and modulation. Only issue is the massing and height.
- Get light into the exit corridor and parkade, ensure light gets in.
- Very well thought out project.
- Unfortunate that we can't see the finished condition along 3rd Street. Acknowledge the entry of building and humanize the edge with seating. It needs more development in terms of landscape for the entry.
- Explore the idea of small trees on the level 6 terrace. It is south facing with sun, having shade will soften that edge.
- There needs to be more interest up on rooftop level and bigger planters.
- The east and west elevations are concerning if the sites to the east and west are developed with similar massing. Blank walls have the potential to make a bit of a canyon, make it into a space, not a sliver.
- The treatment of the parkade is innovative. I find that the above grade parking is imposing on the lane, maybe consider more penetrations in the wall and trees. Use something to soften and minimize the size on that side.
- Based on the zoning, massing and form and characters, it is well-articulated.
- Concern on the 7th storey massing on 3rd street. The scale of lane is well done; want that to be the same on 3rd street.
- The first level could step a bit so there is a breakdown from the street. It's a lot at the street.
- The stairwell at the top looks like you might be able to drop the ceilings to step the stairwells. The top of the stair is closer into the units; you could step in 4ft to reduce the shoulders on the sides of the massing.
- Scale of the massing is massive, could be helped by a vertical breakdown of the street front.
- For the lane there could be a planter against the parkade in the back to breakdown the harshness of the long wall could be repeated from front.
- Any opportunities in the trees to have a pedestrian cut through mid-block for access, although this should be done safely.
- The suites are well thought out.
- The circulation in the garages is really tight. It could be a little more generous between the garage and corridors.
- Consider a garbage room on both levels.
- Get natural light into the fitness room.

- The heavy masses are well articulated; consider a glass block to bring in more light.
- May need to up the ante beyond 5% above ASHRAE base.
- Consider any opportunities to break the building up at the top level.
- Appreciate the rigours modernity of the building.
- Try to invoke the North Shore and introduce more natural materials.
- Within the OCP you have to think long-term, eventually this building won't be such an anomaly. I'm okay with the massing and height due to this.
- Landscape is well done. The relationship between landscaping and the building is well thought-out

Presenter's comments:

Thank you for all the comments.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Rezoning Application for 236 – 254 East 3rd Street and recommends approval subject to addressing the following issues to the satisfaction of the Development Planner:

- Mitigate the buildings' overall massing at street levels and 3rd Street frontage;
- Explore opportunities to break down and reduce the massing of the upper levels including the access stairs;
- Explore ways to soften the building edge along the lane with more openings into the building;
- Consider ways to create paths between the buildings;
- Explore ways to reduce the constrained circulation in the parkade;
- Further develop the fenestration and articulation on the east and west facades;
- Ensure more natural light and openings into the lower level corridors, fitness room and parkade;
- Explore opportunities for trees and larger planters on the upper levels to create more interest on the roofscape;
- Address the landscaping on the East 3rd Street public realm and unit entries as the project develops;
- Further develop landscaping to highlight the main entrance;
- Encouraged to be more ambitious with sustainability and energy efficiency targets;
- Explore opportunities for e-bikes and e-car outlets; and
- Explore further opportunities for integrated art in the project.

The Panel wishes to thank the applicant for their presentation.

Carried Unanimously

6:55PM - K. Yushmanova leaves due to a conflict of interest.

5. Moodyville – Wall Financial: Phase 1, 2A & 2B (Development Permit Application)

This second review is for three development permit applications under the East 3rd Street Area (Moodyville) DPA Guidelines. The proposed designs are for a mixture of townhouse and apartment buildings over three phases and three separate development permits. Each phase was previously presented at a meeting of the Advisory Design Panel on October 4th 2017. All

three projects were not recommended for approval by the panel and were asked to return and respond to issues defined in the panel's October 4th resolutions.

Staff would be interested in the Panel's input regarding the following:

- The design, façade, and architectural vernacular of the buildings as they respond to and potentially coordinate and demonstrate individuality with other buildings of the Moodyville Area and each other;
- The overall massing and form of each building as it relates to both the street edge, greenway edge, and the internal spaces of the proposed development;
- The quality and effectiveness of the typology of the proposed shared corridor upper-level stacked units;
- Quality and overall cohesiveness of the landscape plan, pedestrian circulation, as well as, transitions between common and private outdoor spaces;
- The nature and quality of the shared open spaces provided in this plan;
- The design quality and approach towards incorporating a Living Laneway as part of the design;
- The interface with neighbouring properties;
- Design regarding sustainability and energy performance goals;
- Quality of livability and CPTED responses for the townhouses, apartments, and associated accessory lock-off units in this proposal;
- The responses by the applicant for each phase to the Resolutions of the Advisory Design Panel of October 4th 2017.

Phase 1 (DPA2017-00021): 509 – 603 East 2nd Street

- 1.45 FSR design for a 7 building project
- 62 units (Mix of 26 three and four storey townhomes with 5 accessible lock-offs and 36 four storey stacked townhomes accessed by elevator)
- 105 Parking stalls - 6 visitor - 93 Bike Parking (Underground)

Resolutions of October 4th, 2017:

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Development Permit Application for 509-603 East 2nd Street and does not recommend approval of the submission pending resolution of the following issues listed below:

- Encouraged to develop a story into aspects of the project that will make it unique to Moodyville;
- Bring more variety and individuality into the architectural form (ensure diversity of form and character within this phase and between the other presented phases);
- Consider the use of water above grade to create unique features;
- Explore the opportunity to express sustainability in an effort to make the project more unique. For example: with passive ventilation;
- Explore opportunities to make the vertical circulation cores more unique in terms of different materials or glazing;
- Encouraged to use more colours in materials;
- Explore potential for public art in the project;

- Ensure more connectivity from north to south through the site (ensure site permeability is achieved to connect this phase to other phases and spaces in of the Moodyville area);
- Ensure visual and pedestrian connectivity;
- Consider covered outdoor areas for seating;
- Ensure more seating groups in outdoor gathering spaces;
- Examine increasing the space between the buildings on the north side;
- Review the repetitive forms along the north elevations;
- Encourage more roof protection at the 4th level;
- Consider more flex uses in the living lane;
- Explore more design development at end walls;
- Explore opportunities to introduce light into the parkade; and
- Consider separating and improving the experience of the garbage and recycling areas.

Staff asked Panel for feedback on how well the applicant responded to the October 4th motion and if the changes introduce additional comments.

Martin Bruckner, IBI Group, reviewed the response to the resolution:

- We have brightened up the palate.
- Using the same architectural colours. The bases of the buildings are in red brick opposed to the dark brick previously used.
- Increased permeability through the site.
- Stairs down to the living lane have been added.
- Colours identify entry ways into townhouse units.
- Introduced different shades of roofing to create visual interest.
- Added windows in bedrooms where possible.
- Provided continuous rain cover at the top exterior walkway.
- The units project forward and back. The colouration has improved at the top walkway
- At the blocks on 2nd Street we have introduced breaks and opened up the space between the three blocks.
- We have introduced textures and colours with shingle and siding material.
- Added windows into the stair shaft to improve security and add visual interest.
- Varied the roofline of the interior townhouses, sloping out at the ends and flat in the middle.
- Furniture in the public realm might be informed in an artistic way. We are exploring a public art component.

Grant Brumpton, PWL Partnership, reviewed the response to the landscape plan:

- With the “Trails” name we wanted to bring a sense of what it is like to live on the North Shore and tie it in, which then becomes obvious in the landscape.
- On the North Shore, landscape is more lush and of a forest character. Native plants have been incorporated into the project.
- With the notion of the trail, the trail system has nodes, having the gathering places to build community is important and we have added that in.
- Explored a series of elements that speak to what we want to achieve.
- Added an outdoor open air trellis in the amenity space and a green roof.

- Materials are heavy timber, in a number of forms, dry stack expression in stones and the ribbon wall.
- Each unit has own identification that fits in with the theme.
- We have added in a few wayfinding markers through the central amenity space.
- We have enhanced the size and configuration of amenity spaces.
- We have enhanced the connection across the living lane and added a special paving treatment.
- The spaces between buildings are larger.
- The building is stepped to frame the entryways on 2nd Street.
- We have added urban agriculture, seating areas, and compost.

Phase 2A (DPA2017-00025): 548 – 602 East 1st Street

- 1.13 FSR design for a 3 building project
- 13 units (Three and four storey townhomes, including 3 accessible lock-offs)
- 23 Parking stalls - 4 visitor - 20 Bike Parking (Underground)

Resolutions of October 4th, 2017:

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Development Permit Application for 548-602 East 1st Street and does not recommend approval of the submission pending resolution of the following issues listed below:

- Create permeability through the site from north to south down to the PMT (ensure site permeability is achieved to connect this phase to other phases and spaces in of the Moodyville area);
- Explore more opportunities to use colour to break up the architectural expression (ensure diversity of form and character within this phase and between the other presented phases);
- Explore varying materials on all four facades of building;
- Encouraged to animate the laneway where possible; and
- Encouraged to move the boulders next to the visitor parking stalls.

Phase 2B (DPA2017-00026): 502 – 528 East 1st Street

- 1.51 FSR design for a 4 building project
- 33 units (mix of 4 three storey townhomes with accessible lock-offs, 7 four storey townhomes and 22 four storey stacked townhomes accessed by elevator)
- 54 Parking stalls - 2 visitor - 50 Bike Parking (Underground) - 2 lane access stalls

Resolutions of October 4th, 2017:

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Development Permit Application for 502-528 East 1st Street and does not recommend approval of the submission pending resolution of the following issues listed below:

- Reconsider the response to facades of all buildings. (ensure diversity of form and character within this phase and between the other presented phases);
- Ensure site permeability is achieved to connect this phase to other phases and spaces in of the Moodyville area;

- Provide natural light into the parkade and resolve the issue with the garage entrances;
- Explore the use of colour on facades and lighten them in some situations; and
- Encouraged more design development at the ends of the buildings.

Staff asked Panel for feedback on how well the applicant responded to the October 4th motion and if the changes introduce additional comments.

Martin Bruckner, IBI Group, reviewed the response to the resolution:

- We have added stairs to walk all the way thorough to Phase 1 and 2B.
- We moved boulders next to visitor parking stalls.
- More variety to pop up roofs.
- Windows in the bedrooms will be able to be opened from the inside.
- Added a variety of texture and colour with the cladding.
- Added colour and texture to the massing.
- Brightened palette including lighter coloured brick.
- Added fenestration on the stairs.
- Buildings are staggered that face the street and living lane. The expression to the lane is completely different than Phase 1.

Grant Brumpton, PWL Partnership, reviewed the response landscape plan:

- The main change was the added stair by the PMT.
- We added colour onto the greenway.
- Same general context and forms and shapes.
- With heavy timber materials, dry stack and stone, and a green roof trellis.
- Widen the spaces between buildings and garage requirements removed ability to retain large trees.

Questions from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Which area does the general public have access to? **A:** The public has access throughout the site. Visitors could access on foot and drive into the parkade.
- As a first responder, how I find a specific unit or address? **A:** In Phase 1, addresses are on 2nd street. There will be a fire alarm panel room at grade which will be addressed. Each unit will have their own front door at grade level.
- How will police and ambulance responders navigate? **A:** There is wayfinding for each of the locations, for both Phases.
- Is there a visitor parking plan? **A:** Yes, they have an access to elevator to get to grade as well as exit stairs. There is a gated separation between visitor and resident parking.
- For the exterior elevations on Phase 1, what kind of wood are you using and what colour? **A:** Wooden soffit, cedar, not defined yet.
- There is a lot of Hardie board, how are the joints treated? **A:** There will be overlapping joints on the horizontal building.
- How are the roofdecks separated and how high are the fences? **A:** There is a wall with a frosted glass screen behind. The handrail height is approximately 3ft 6in.
- In Phase 1 where is the garbage and recycling? **A:** Toward the middle of the building.

- In Phase 2B, are the garages created for the units separated by walls or garage doors? **A:** There are walls here.
- Have you lost any units? **A:** No, just reconfigured.
- To staff: any loss of public realm along 2nd or 1st St in the future? **A:** Not changing anything, all improvements of the plan will be part of the DP.
- In Phase 2B, is it possible to get the garage on the south west unit? **A:** We have been advised by planning not to have a carport coming off of it. The grading is difficult here.
- Staff: the bylaw has restrictions on access for private garages on larger sites.
- We can try to find somewhere in the bylaw where it could work due the support received.
- In the overall plan, there are nine lots that are not owned by the developer yet? **A:** We are working on acquiring all lots.

Comments from the Panel included but were not limited to:

- Having it open to the public provides a lot of traffic; ensure you have a robust plan of the site and unit identification. Police and paramedics need to have good site identification for them.
- Landscape plan must be maintained to avoid overgrowth to make it dark.
- Changes are improvements aesthetically, for the living lane especially.
- Look at rain protection over the doors.
- Suite layouts are very liveable, consider room for dressers.
- Landscape treatments at nodes are good.
- Stepping of the units, the entries from front to rear and permeability are all excellent.
- Playfulness of roof form is good and subtle.
- Blank facades could use more work.
- The flow of the landscape is excellent.
- Benches, materiality and wayfinding are extremely important. This could be done artfully with the gates.
- The garage doors on Phase 2B could provide uniqueness and change.
- The landscape is rich and lush with curvy expression - well done.
- Concern with lack of diversity of form and character throughout development. The consistency of form and character throughout the development doesn't support Moodyville guidelines. Different versions of the same thing, consider diversity of form.
- Concerned that there will be more of the same material and expressions of form throughout a much larger site. It will erode a lot of the work that's been done in creating the trail, mews and living lane.
- Adding the connections, making the nodes more unique and identifiable was a good choice.
- The nine empty lots can be an area of respite from the uniformity.
- Put aside this palette and look at something else for these lots. Add an amenity and different typology. They could contain units but not more of the same.
- Potential for something wonderful to give a real identity and good sheltered amenity spaces for the overall development.
- There's an opportunity to add concealed path lighting along the paths and at seating.

Presenter's comments:

Thank you for all the comments.

It was regularly moved and seconded

THAT the Advisory Design Panel has reviewed the Development Permit Application for Moodyville – Wall Financial, Phase 1: 509-603 East 2nd Street, Phase 2A: 548-602 East 1st Street, and Phase 2B: 502-528 East 1st Street and recommends approval subject to addressing the following issues to the satisfaction of the Development Planner:

- Consider furthering the diversity of the form and character in the architectural expression;
- Ensure that while moving forward into future Phases, there is an explicit differentiation and departure in the architectural expression from these proposals in keeping with Moodyville guidelines;
- Ensure unit identification and wayfinding provided is clear for all units of the site;
- Ensure that natural surveillance and CPTED strategies in the semi-public realm are upheld with path lighting and landscape that is not overgrown and dark;
- Ensure that landscape design is further refined with staff in both semi-public and public realm spaces;
- The Panel expresses a general support for garage entries off of 1st Street and the living lane noting the potential conflict with current the bylaw;
- Explore opportunities for common amenities throughout the site that facilitate varied activities; and
- Explore the potential for including rain protection in public nodes.

**Voting on resolutions has been tabled until the November 29th meeting.*

The Panel wishes to thank the applicant for their presentation.

**Carried
7 in favour
1 opposed**

7. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:04 p.m.

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel will be held on Wednesday, December 13th, 2017.



Chair